



## Corporation of the Township of Esquimalt

# SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Monday, January 24, 2011

Esquimalt Municipal Hall – Council Chambers

6:00 pm.

## MINUTES

**PRESENT:** Mayor Barbara Desjardins (Chair), Councillor Meagan Brame, Councillor Randall Garrison, Councillor Don Linge.

**REGRETS:** Councillor Bruce McIldoon, Councillor Alison Gaul, Councillor Lynda Hundleby.

**STAFF:** Laurie Hurst, Chief Administrative Officer  
Jeff Miller, Director of Engineering & Public Works  
Carollyne Evans, Corporate Administrator

**OTHER:** Anthony Beks, Recording Secretary

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Desjardins called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

### 2. LATE ITEMS

(1) Notice of Motion: Renaming of E&N Trail – Councillor Garrison

### 3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

**MOTION:** That the agenda be approved as amended.  
**MOVED/SECONDED.** Councillor Linge/Councillor Garrison.  
**CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### 4. COMMUNICATIONS

(1) Letter from the Capital Regional District, dated December 3, 2010, RE: Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project – Community Benefit Framework Reports

- a) CRD Staff Report to Core Area Liquid Waste Management Committee Meeting of September 22, 2010
- b) Considerations in Preparing a Community Benefit Framework for the Capital Regional District's Wastewater Treatment Program

Mayor Desjardins invited Council members to speak to the CRD Core Area Wastewater Treatment Project. She also noted that Council Members who were absent had provided written submissions.

Council members thanked community members for their submissions, which were well thought out, good material.

Highlights from Council presentations:

- Important to have a framework and community benefits, but there are gaps.
- Lack of CRD communication directly with the residents of Esquimalt or Esquimalt Council.
- Council has not received a direct response from CRD on Council's concerns.
- The CRD still has not got the project right; this is the wrong plan
- This is not where the plant should be, at the base of our inner harbour;
- Hartland set precedent with compensation, mitigation and community benefits.
- This is a regional issue; community benefits are important to whatever community gets this.
- Lack of confidence in the CRD's cost outline; costs may be far greater than the CRD has anticipated.
- The CRD has not properly considered issues like the loss of ongoing property tax revenue to Esquimalt Municipality.
- Lack of adequate public consultation about mitigation and community benefits.
- The terms used by the CRD are confusing; specifics are missing.
- Council should ask the provincial government to look at the project again.
- CRD report and the Westland report are contradictory in several areas.
- The CRD cannot compare this project with the Trent Street Pump station in terms of consultation, mitigation and benefits.
- The neighbourhood is not 1.5 km away; what about the residents across the street and DND?

## 2) Public Input

Mayor Desjardins invited members of the public to speak on the issue. She acknowledged that Council has received many written submissions.

*Dale Wood, Greenwood Avenue*, suggested that Council build allies within the community to convince the public that the harbour should not be the site of a liquid waste treatment plant. He was surprised that the Mayor of the City of Victoria is not a regional leader and does not understand the impact on the James Bay residents, especially Shoal Point. Mr. Wood stated if the plant is built at McLoughlin Point, no one will truck or ship the material and the CRD will be asking to acquire Macaulay Point; this is just the beginning.

*Kim Bellefontaine, Hadfield Avenue*, spoke against the CRD Staff report and is incensed at the way this project is being pushed forward. It is the wrong plan for Esquimalt and for the CRD. Clause C is bizarre and unfair; all adverse

impacts to the community, including financial loss, must be mitigated. Community benefits should be provided to the community and Hartland set that precedent. The CRD needs to take a longer term view and consider full integration of liquid and solid waste. What happens in 2025 when more land is needed?

*John Burgbush, Old Esquimalt Road*, Chair of ARREST, spoke on behalf of three professors recognized in this area. He suggested that McLoughlin Point is the front door to the CRD community and no one wants an outhouse at their front door. The current CRD plan is lacking and riddled with problems; a triple bottom line analysis is needed. The site is far too small; splitting a treatment plant is contrary to established practice. The problem is that toxins in the storm drains keep going into the harbour and money should be spent to solve this problem, not in building a plant that no one wants, does nothing for the environment and will be outgrown in 2030. He urged Council to demand the CRD go back to square 1.

*Carole Witter, Head Street*, referred to her letter dated January 21, 2011 to Council. She noted that the CRD has only had 3 so-called public consultations in Esquimalt while other communities have had many more, and Esquimalt residents have not been offered any time for direct consultation with the CRD. There is a lack of due process, transparency and community consultation. The plan does not maximize resource recovery, is not forward thinking in its approach, does not consider the long-term impacts on our communities, and is not the best long-term commitment for our region monetarily, environmentally or socially.

*Bruce Cuthbert, Constance Avenue*, stated Esquimalt isn't being communicated with and Esquimalt's concerns are not being heard. Council needs to build alliances with other municipalities and at the provincial and federal level. This is the wrong site for a plant; over 200 cruise ships come into the harbour. Mr. Cuthbert noted he has written letters to the provincial level letting them know Esquimalt is not getting the communication it expects and the socio-economic impact has to consider the future of the entire CRD. He noted Toronto recognizes the importance of the sustainability of its waterfront and created the Waterfront Toronto Institution.

*Gerry Froese, Greenwood Avenue*, stated that the project likely can't be stopped now and suggested that instead of specific amenities, that Council focus its efforts on creating a royalty fund not tied to a percentage of the project's total cost, but a revenue tax of having the plant in our community. Mr. Froese referenced an Alberta heritage fund that the oil industry had to pay into.

*Dave Hodgins, Craigflower Road*, congratulated the Mayor for her leadership. He stated there is a lack of evidence based decision making in the current CRD proposal. There are gaps: we have to be careful about what is being proposed for mitigation and identifying the solution. What is needed is more communication, more collaboration, cooperation, consultation and common sense from the CRD. The best solutions come from the community and the CRD needs to do much more listening.

*Muriel Dunn, Old Esquimalt Road*, supported all the comments which had been made against the proposal. .

*Karen James, Plaskett Place*, said she is getting feedback that treating sewage may not be a necessity of population growth. Residents haven't been fully informed about what is going right about our current method and are being seduced with the illusion of economic value of resource recovery. This is not the right plan and taxes are already high enough.

*Eleanor Calder, Woodway Road*, said two important issues to consider are that this is the wrong plan and the trust factor. The CRD has an illusion that they have developed a relationship with us and that is different from what we think it should be.

*Ed Williams, Dunsmuir Road*, said Esquimalt's voice is small: small at the CRD and small within our whole community. We need to get public opinion on Esquimalt's side. We have a beautiful harbour and perhaps we need to do a Utube video with a toilet superimposed over the entrance to grab some attention.

*Beth Burton-Krahn, Hadfield Avenue*, indicated that Esquimalt has lots of amazing, smart people but Esquimalt is being trounced on because economically Esquimalt is the poorest municipality in the region. She stated Esquimalt needs to push back and pursue legal action against the CRD for lack of public consultation,

The Mayor invited Council members to provide additional comments. A summary of these comments follows.

- The actual benefit from resource recovery may be negative; the public needs solid figures.
- We need material that shows what the outflows look like; we need to fix the toxins and the pharmaceuticals going into the water at source.
- We need to show that it is not a bad plan continuing with the system we have.
- It is hard to talk about a framework when the costs are not known and the numbers keep changing.
- We don't trust the CRD to follow through. They have proven that time and time again to Esquimalt.
- We have an opportunity with federal and provincial funding to share the costs of sewage treatment.
- This plan was rushed because of the threat of losing possible infrastructure funding.
- There may be opportunities opening up to restart the dialogue on site selection.
- A plan for resource recovery has to have the generation of that energy near where you are going to use that energy.
- Resource recovery is an important component of a plan, but the current plan is inadequate and only equates to \$3 million by the year 2030. The City of Edmonton gets \$135 million in dividend payments in resource

recovery and we should be able to strive for that here.

- The decision to not have bio-solids on land is a good decision; there is a lot of evidence that that creates problems.
- The CRD should be listening to their experts who have said that McLoughlin Point isn't a good location.

Staff Comments on the Community Benefit Framework Reports

- Huge discrepancies in the report. (6 different major points in direct contradiction).
- Lack of public input and the precedent of Hartland.

**MOTION:** That Staff bring back a draft summary of the input received at the January 24, 2011 Special Committee of the Whole before a response goes back to the CRD on the Community Benefits Framework. **MOVED SECONDED.** Councillor Linge/Councillor Brame. **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

5. **PUBLIC QUESTION AND COMMENT PERIOD**

*Karen James, Plaskett Place*, asked if the written reports from the Councillors not at the meeting would be available for review. The Mayor indicated they would be incorporated into the staff summary.

*Bruce Cuthbert*, Member of the Esquimalt Residents Association, indicated that there is talk of having a forum or public rally and looked for participation from Council and members of the public.

6. **NOTICE OF MOTION**

(1) Re-Naming of E&N Trail

The Notice of Motion from Councillor Garrison on Re-naming of the E&N Trail was received and will be brought forward to the February 7<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Council meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT** at 7:45 pm.

**MOTION:** That the Special Committee of the Whole Meeting be adjourned. **MOVED/SECONDED.** Councillor Brame/Councillor Garrison. **CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

---

MAYOR OF THE CORPORATION OF THE  
TOWNSHIP OF ESQUIMALT  
THIS 14<sup>th</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2011

CERTIFIED CORRECT:

---

LAURIE HURST  
DEPUTY CORPORATE ADMINISTRATOR